

Response to 17 July 2008 action
Page 16 of 17

Appl. no. 10/579,109
Atty. ref. VM001cOnUSb

REMARKS

Entry of the foregoing claim amendments will result in claims 1-5 and 7-21 being pending; of these 20 claims, only claim 1 is independent, and none are presented in multiple dependent form; accordingly, no extra claim fees (total, independent or multiple dependency) are believed to be. The only fee included herewith is the one-month extension request.

Numerous amendments have been made to the specification. Many are directed to providing a text that employs English terminology and phrasing that is more idiomatic, and others are directed at addressing the informality issue addressed on page 2 of the 7/17 Action; no explicit textual support is believed necessary for these. Support for the remaining textual amendments is believed to be self-evident, and the examiner is invited to contact the undersigned directly with any specific questions.

The abstract also has been amended, which is believed to address the issue set forth at page 2 of the 7/17 Action.

Regarding the claim support issue set forth at page 2 of the 7/17 Action, Applicant submits that Tables A and B provide essentially literal support for original claims 1-9, so reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested. (From the foregoing, textual support for the amended claims also is believed to be self-evident, but the examiner again is invited to contact the undersigned directly with any specific questions.)

Original claims 1 and 6 were rejected as anticipated by or obvious over any of a variety of references. Claim 6 has been canceled, so that rejection has been obviated. Claim 1 has been amended to specify the types of inhibiting additives present in the composition; none of the cited references are submitted to teach or suggest claim 1 as presently presented. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully solicited.

Original claims 7-9 were allowed, and original claims 2-5 were objected to solely because they depended from a rejected claim. The foregoing amendments should not affect the acknowledged patentability of claims 7-9, each of which now depends from claim 16. Additionally, claims 2-5 provide additional patentable distinctions beyond that of independent claim 1.

Response to 17 July 2008 action
Page 17 of 17

Appl. no. 10/579,109
Atty. ref. VM001c0nUSb

Continued examination and early allowance of the present application is respectfully requested.

Inquiries concerning this submission specifically, as well as the application in general, should be directed to the attention of the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,



David G. Burleson, Reg. No. 38,090
Attorney for Applicant

October 27, 2008

ZOLLINGER & BURLESON LTD.
Post Office Box 2368
Canton, Ohio 44720-0368
phone: 330/526-0104, x2
facsimile: 866/311-9964